

**ORIGINAL****In the United States Court of Federal Claims****FILED****FEB - 9 2017****U.S. COURT OF  
FEDERAL CLAIMS**


\* \* \* \* \*

**LAUREN PAULSON,****Plaintiff,****v.****UNITED STATES,****Defendant.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**No. 16-1003C****Filed: February 9, 2017****ORDER**

On August 15, 2016, pro se plaintiff Lauren Paulson filed the above captioned case in the United States Court of Federal Claims as well as a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. On October 14, 2016, the defendant filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. Plaintiff did not file a timely response. On December 14, 2016, the court issued an Order instructing plaintiff to respond to the defendant's motion to dismiss or for plaintiff to show cause in a filing with the court why plaintiff's case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute by December 30, 2016. Plaintiff did not timely respond. Instead, on January 9, 2017, plaintiff submitted a motion for recusal and alternative dispute resolution (ADR), a motion for a pro bono attorney, and a motion to extend deadlines, none of which complied with the Rules of the Court of Federal Claims. Nonetheless, on January 13, 2017, the court instructed the Clerk's Office to file the motions, and denied plaintiff's motion for recusal and assignment as an ADR judge and denied plaintiff's motion for appointment of pro bono counsel. The court granted plaintiff's motion for an extension of the deadlines in the court's December 14, 2016 Order, but as noted in the January 13, 2017 Order: "The court reiterates that failure by the plaintiff to file a response to defendant's motion to dismiss by January 26, 2017 will result in dismissal for failure to prosecute as indicated in the court's December 14, 2016 order." Rule 41(b) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims states, in part: "If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, the court may dismiss on its own motion or the defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it." As of February 9, 2017, plaintiff has not filed a response to the defendant's October 14, 2016 motion to dismiss. Therefore, pursuant to RCFC 41(b), the above-captioned case is **DISMISSED**, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute. The Clerk's Office shall enter **JUDGMENT** consistent with this Order. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**
  
**MARIAN BLANK HORN**  
 Judge

7014 1200 0000 9093 6583